## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 37048 & 37049

STATE OF IDAHO,	) 2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 560
Plaintiff-Respondent,	) Filed: July 22, 2010
v.	) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER JONES,	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Appeal from the District Court of the Falls County. Hon. Randy J. Stoker, Dis	ifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin strict Judge.
Independent of a majerial and a might de-	

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance, <u>affirmed</u>; judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for aggravated assault, <u>affirmed</u>.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Heather M. Carlson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge; and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated cases, Michael Christopher Jones pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1); and aggravated assault, I.C. §§ 18-901, 18-906, 18915(1)(b). In exchange for his guilty pleas, the district court dismissed an additional charge, a sentencing weapons enhancement, and an allegation that Jones was a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Jones to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance and a concurrent unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for aggravated assault. Jones appeals.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Jones's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.